

REMARKS

The office action of June 17, 2005 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1 through 9 remain in this case.

The Examiner called on June 6, 2005 requesting an oral election to the above restriction, but Applicant's agent did not make an election at that time.

Restriction Requirement

The Examiner has made a restriction requirement and has identified four groups as follows:

Group I - recited in claims 1-6, drawn to a sprocket, classified in class 474, subclass 152.

Group II - recited in claims 7- 9, drawn to a method of manufacturing, classified in class 72, subclass 199.

The election of Group I defined by claims 1-6, drawn to a sprocket, classified in class 474, subclass 152 is confirmed. This requirement for restriction and election as best understood are respectfully traversed.

The MPEP states the following with regard to stating a prima facie case of restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

“There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

1) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP 802.01, 806.04, 808.01) **or distinct as claimed** (see MPEP 806.05-806.05(i)); and

2) There must be a **serious burden on the examiner** if restriction is not required (see MPEP 803.02, 806.04(a) - 806.04(j), 808.01(a) and 808.02).

GUIDELINES

Examiners must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions, but need not cite documents to support the requirement in most cases. **Where plural inventions are capable of being viewed as related in two ways, both applicable criteria for distinctness must be demonstrated to support a restriction requirement...**For purposes of the initial requirement a serious burden on the examiner may be prima facie shown if the examiner shows by appropriate explanation either separate classification, separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP 808.02." (MPEP 803)


All of the inventions would be searched within the same classes and subclasses. Even if some of the inventions would be classified separately, a thorough search of the prior art for any one of the inventions would include the classes and subclasses of the other inventions.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
Naoji Sakamoto-

By: 
Lynda Wood, Reg. No. 53,791
Attorney for Applicant

BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St.

Ithaca, NY 14850

(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)

e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com

Dated: 7/8/05

